

**Remarks**

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-12 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Mann, II et al. (US Patent No. 5,577,186).

Mann discloses a computer instructional system that teaches only computer skills. Mann does not address providing a problem to be solved where the problem to be solved is tied to a core curriculum subject matter, such as math, science, reading, etc. Therefore, Mann does not anticipate every element of these claims.

In the rejection of claim 14, to which the amended claims are now similar, the office action stated that Mann teaches 'identifying core curriculum components related to the technology objectives,' and referred to col. 4, lines 56-63. This language refers only to the generality of the interface provided and does not address connecting the context in which computer skills are being taught to a particular core curriculum subject matter. Therefore, Mann alone, or in combination with other references, does not render obvious the subject matter of these claims.

As amended, claims 1, 8, 17 and 19 require that the user interface provide a problem tied to core curriculum subject matter.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 8, 17 and 19, as well as their dependent claims 2, 6-7, 10-12, and 18-19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 3-5, 9, 13-16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann in view of Cook et al. (US Patent No. 5,727,950).

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1, claim 9 and 13 depend from claim 8. As discussed above, Mann does not teach all of the elements of the base claim. Cook does nothing to overcome that deficiency. The combination of Mann and Cook does not teach presenting a

problem tied to core curriculum subject matter that is to be solved using a user interface for a particular type of software application.

It is therefore submitted that claims 3-5, 9 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 14 and 16 have been amended to more clearly state that the problem to be solved is tied to core curriculum subject matter. As discussed above, contrary to the portion of Mann cited by the office action, Mann does not teach, show nor suggest this, and Cook does not overcome this deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claims 14 and 16, and claim 15 that depends from claim 14, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed is not considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

#### Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison St., Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number 571-273-8300, on September 6, 2005.

Signature  
*Lauren Ballard-Gemmell*  
Lauren Ballard-Gemmell

Docket No. 5594-002

Page 7 of 7

Application No. 10/687,100